REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-22, 25-39 and 44-46 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 13, 23, 24 and 40-43 have been cancelled, claims 1, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 21 and 25-32 have been amended, and claims 44-46 have been added by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claim 40 was objected to; claims 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 19-23, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-yi in view of Lee; claims 3 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-yi in view of Lee and Flannery; claims 5-12, 24-31 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-yi in view of Lee and Kirkland; and claims 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-yi in view of Lee and Bi et al.

Further, the Advisory Action dated November 23, 2007, indicates Hung-yi teaches sending out a warning signal and sound to remind the user that the pre-set time-limit is coming to an end soon, and once passing the pre-set time-limit, the main program restarts the screen saver. The Advisory Action also indicates Kirkland teaches a visual warning message window indicative of the remaining time.

Claim Objection

Regarding the objection to the claim 40, the subject matter similar to that recited in claim 40 has been added into claim 1, and claim 40 has been cancelled. Further, the subject matter added into claim 1 has been amended to address the objection to claim 40. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Regarding the rejection of claims 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, it is respectfully noted independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include the subject matter recited in dependent claims 40-41 and 42-43, respectively and claims 40-43 have been cancelled.

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated: February 8, 2008   .

Docket No.:0465-1116P
Art Unit: 2173
Page 11 of 15

Further, the subject matter added into independent claims 1 and 21 has been amended to address the rejection of claims 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the subject matter has been amended to correspond with the language used in the specification at paragraph [0026], for example. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-15, 19-23, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hung-yi in view of Lee. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include subject matter similar to that as recited in dependent claims 40-41 and 42-43, respectively. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method of providing an advanced screen saver warning for a display apparatus includes controlling, during the continuous execution of the advance screen saver warning, the display apparatus to output at least one of a specified sound and a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time, wherein the at least one of the specified sound and the visual warning message window is initiated based on the counting of said current system idle time and is deactivated by detection of system activity. Independent claim 21 includes similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by paragraph [0026] and Figure 5 of the present application. For example, Figures 5A-5F illustrate outputting a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advanced screen saver warning time. Further, a specified sound may also be used as indicated in paragraph [0026]. In addition, one of the specified sound and the visual warning message window is initiated based on the counting of the current system idle time and is deactivated by the detection of system activity.

Thus, the present invention is directed to controlling the display apparatus before activation of the screen saver program. That is, the advance screen saver warning time warns a user about an upcoming activation of the screen saver when there is a specified period of system input inactivity. Further, the user does not have to go through the laborious operation of re-entering password information, etc. to re-log into the computer when the screen saver is activated. Further, as shown

in Figure 5, the user is informed about an amount of time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advanced screen saver warning time so that he or she can determine when the screen saver is going to be activated.

The Final Office Action uses portions of the three different references to come up with the claimed invention. In particular, the Final Office Action recognizes Hung-yi does not disclose counting a current system idle time during which no system input activity is detected, where the activated advance screen saver warning is continuously executed by the display apparatus until a detection of system activity, whereupon the advance screen saver warning is deactivated, and the screen saver is activated only if the advance screen saver warning time is completed, and relies on Lee as teaching these features.

However, Lee is directed to entering a hibernate mode only after an extended operation of a screen saver. Thus, adding the counted time period in Lee with Hung-yi would only result in a time period that is counted after the screen saver has been activated. That is, Lee is specifically directed to counting a time period after the screen saver has been executed and thus one skilled in the art would only apply the teachings in Lee with regard to after the screen saver in Hung-yi has been executed. In more detail, Hung-yi only discloses the execution of a screen saver after a particular user's time allotment has expired. Thus, combining Lee with Hung-yi would result in the computer in Hung-yi going into a hibernate mode after the screen saver has been executed for a predetermined amount of time.

For example, Hung-yi is directed to computer systems that are utilized by several different users such as in a library. Each user is given access to the computer only for a predetermined amount of time such as 30 minutes. In Hung-yi, the user is notified that their time allotment is about to expire and then a screen saver is executed at the end of the allotted time such that a next user can log onto the computer. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hung-yi or Lee about warning a user about an upcoming screen saver during system inactivity such that the user can avoid having to go through the cumbersome process of re-entering their user ID and password, for example. That is, Hung-yi is specifically directed to warning a user about their time allotment expiring (and not about the screen saver being activated) during system activity (and not during system inactivity). Further, Lee is only directed to the computer being placed

into a hibernate mode when the screen saver has <u>already been activated</u> for a certain amount of time. Thus, combining Hung-yi with Lee does not result in the above-noted features of the present invention.

Further, the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action relies on Kirkland as teaching wherein, during the continuous execution of the advance screen saver warning, the display apparatus is controlled by said controller to output at least one of a specified sound and a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time, and the at least one of the specified sound and the visual warning message window is initiated based on the counter counting the current system idle time and is deactivated by detection of system activity. The Office Actions then indicate it would have been obvious to combine Kirkland with Hyung-yi and Lee.

However, Kirkland is related to displaying an amount of time left for a downloading operation. There is no teaching or suggestion about providing at least one of a specified sound and a visual warning message window indicative of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time. Further, it is not clear how one skilled in the art would look to Kirkland, which specifically teaches displaying an amount of time left for a download operation, to provide a specified sound or visual warning about an upcoming screen saver being displayed, especially because neither Hyung-yi or Lee are directed to warning a user about an upcoming screen saver being activated.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1 and 21 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims and the additional applied references also do not teach or suggest the features recited in the correspondent independent claims.

Application No. 10/747,949
Amendment dated: February 8, 2008   .

Docket No.:0465-1116P
Art Unit: 2173
Page 14 of 15

New claims

In addition, new claims 44-46 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicant respectfully submits the new claims are supported by the originally-filed application. For example, new claims 44 and 45 clarify that the predetermined screen saver standby time and advance screen saver warning time are manually set by a user of the display apparatus (see paragraph [0025], for example). New claim 46 corresponds to features disclosed in claims 1, 6, 10 and 11. It is respectfully submitted these new claims are also allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone David A. Bilodeau., Registration No. 42,325, at (703) 205-8072, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
James T. Eller, Jr.
Registration No.: 39,538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant